



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE HAWAIIAN SITUATION.

I.—THE INVASION OF HAWAII.

BY EUGENE TYLER CHAMBERLAIN.

DANIEL WEBSTER, Secretary of State, on July 14, 1851, wrote to Luther Severance, representing the United States at Honolulu :

“The Government of the United States was the first to acknowledge the national existence of the Hawaiian Government, and to treat with it as an independent state. Its example was soon followed by several of the Governments of Europe ; and the United States, true to its treaty obligations, has in no case interfered with the Hawaiian Government for the purpose of opposing the course of its own independent conduct or of dictating to it any particular line of policy. In acknowledging the independence of the Islands, and of the Government established over them, it was not seeking to promote any peculiar object of its own. What it did, and all that it did, was done openly in the face of day, in entire good faith, and known to all nations. . . . But while thus indisposed to exercise any sinister influence itself over the counsels of Hawaii, or to overawe the proceedings of its Government by the menace or the actual application of superior military force, it expects to see other powerful nations act in the same spirit.”

Mr. Webster went further, directing Mr. Severance to return to the Hawaiian Government an act of contingent surrender to the United States, placed in his hands by that Government, and specifically warned Mr. Severance against encouraging in any quarter the idea that the Islands would be annexed to the United States.

Up to January 16, 1893, the broad principles laid down in Mr. Webster's quoted words were not only the rule of conduct for the Government of the United States in its relations with the Government of Hawaii ; but they were also recognized by those who desire, as well as by those who do not desire, the

annexation of the Hawaiian archipelago to this country. The state papers of Secretary Marcy and Secretary Blaine, and the published utterances of other distinguished citizens of the United States who have regarded annexation as the ultimate and desirable destiny of these islands of the Pacific, will be searched to no purpose for indications of a belief that annexation should be brought about otherwise than in fidelity to treaty obligations, "openly in the face of day, in entire good faith and known to all nations," and without the "menace or actual application of superior military force." A belief to the contrary is so repugnant to the traditions and temper of the American people, and so clearly involves adherence to the theory of insular colonial expansion by conquest, that one may safely assert it will find scant favor among the people of the United States.

The dethronement of Queen Liliuokalani and the establishment of an oligarchy on the island of Oahu, "until terms of union with the United States of America have been negotiated and agreed upon," were effected on the afternoon of Tuesday, January 17, 1893, in the presence of a considerable body of the naval forces of the United States, armed with Gatling guns, and stationed in the immediate vicinity and in plain sight of the Palace and Government Building, where the so-called revolution was consummated.

The local causes of this so-called revolution, remote and proximate, are relatively immaterial to the United States. They, with the general issue of annexation, dwindle before the question, What were the purpose and the effect of the presence of the forces of the United States in Honolulu on January the sixteenth and seventeenth?

The recognized government of a nation with which we were at peace had officially notified Minister Stevens, our representative, of its ability to preserve order and protect property. The Vice-Consul-General of the United States, Mr. W. Porter Boyd, testifies that no uneasiness was felt at the consulate, and that the landing of the troops was a complete surprise to him. All the signs of street life betokened good order, and, soon after the blue-jackets had trailed their artillery through the streets, the population of Honolulu was enjoying the regular Monday evening out-of-door concert of the Hawaiian Band. The landing of the troops was promptly followed by the protests of

the proper authorities of the kingdom and the island, transmitted officially to Minister Stevens. No evidence has been presented to Commissioner Blount to show that there was any apprehension or any desire for the presence ashore of the men of the "Boston" under arms, except on the part of the members of the Citizens' Committee of Safety. The matter was not referred to at the mass meeting of the foreign population, organized by that committee, and held but a few hours before the troops landed.

The Committee of Safety, at whose request Mr. Stevens summoned the troops, did not prefer that request as American citizens. It could not, for only five of its thirteen members owed allegiance to and were under the protection of the United States. By the admission of several of their own number to Mr. Blount, they were engaged in plotting secretly the overthrow of the government and the establishment of themselves in power until they could transfer the Islands to the United States, and Minister Stevens was in their full confidence at the time they asked for, and he ordered, the landing of the troops. They had been threatened with arrest by the government they planned to overthrow, and he had promised to protect them. The troops of the "Boston" were the only means he had of keeping good that promise, and he did not scruple to use them for it. But even to the thirteen engaged in the plot the danger of arrest was not so imminent as to deter them from requesting Mr. Stevens not to land the troops too soon for their purposes. Mr. W. O. Smith, the attorney-general of the Provisional Government and a leader in the committee, testifies that at a conference on Monday afternoon, at four o'clock, "our plans had not been perfected, our papers had not been completed, and, after a hasty discussion—the time being short—it was decided that it was impossible for us to take the necessary steps, and we should request that the troops be not landed until the next morning, the hour in the morning being immaterial—whether it was nine, eight, or six o'clock in the morning—but we must have further time to prevent bloodshed." Nevertheless the "Boston's" men landed at five o'clock, Mr. Stevens being apparently the only man on the Island of Oahu who deemed their presence necessary at that time.

To keep pace with Mr. Stevens' haste the Committee of Safety met secretly a few hours later and selected Judge

Sanford B. Dole as the civil head of their oligarchy, and Mr. John H. Soper, a citizen of the United States, as the head of its military forces, then in existence only in the imagination of the conclave. Mr. Soper admits that he did not agree to accept the command of the provisional "army" until he was assured that Minister Stevens would recognize the Provisional Government on Tuesday. On their part both Judge Dole and Minister Stevens apparently did not have entire confidence in the prowess of "General" Soper, as witness the following letter to Judge Dole the next day :

U. S. LEGATION, Jan. 17, 1893.

Think Captain Wiltse will endeavor to maintain order and protect life and property, but do not think he would take command of the men of the Provisional Government. Will have him come to the Legation soon as possible and take his opinion and inform you soon as possible.

Yours truly,

JOHN L. STEVENS.

The purpose of the presence of the blue-jackets, in the minds of the committee that asked for it, is summed up in the admission of Judge Dole that when the troops were first furnished they could not have gotten along without their aid, and of Mr. Henry Waterhouse of the Committee :

"We knew the feeling of those who were in power then—that they were cowards—that by going up with a bold front and they supposing that the American troops would assist us, that would help us out."

The forces of the United States, thus brought ashore against the protest of a friendly Power, at the request of men engaged in a plot to overturn that Power, were stationed, remote from the residences of Americans, less than a hundred yards from the Government Building, designated by Minister Stevens as the place in which the Provisional Government should be established to secure his recognition, and in plain sight of the Queen's palace windows. Admiral Skerrett sums up the disposition of the forces thus :

"The American troops were well located if designed to promote the movement for the Provisional Government, and very improperly located if only intended to protect American citizens in person and property."

The Queen was dethroned and the oligarchy established by proclamation, read by a citizen of the United States, shortly before three o'clock, and recognized, in the name of the United States, by Minister Stevens before it was in possession of any

point held in force by the Queen's government. With more prudence Captain Wiltse, in command of the "Boston," declined to recognize it until it came into possession of the military posts of the Queen, as it did by her voluntary surrender of them early in the evening. Her surrender was in terms "to the superior force of the United States," and "until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representative," and on this understanding it was accepted by the junta.

On February 25, 1843, King Kamehameha III. ceded the Hawaiian Islands to Lord George Paulet under duress of the guns of Her Majesty's ship "Carysfort," subject to review by the government of Queen Victoria, and the British flag was raised over Honolulu. On July 31 of the same year Rear Admiral Richard Thomas, representing the Queen, declined to accept the cession, and recognized the King as the lawful sovereign of the Islands, stating that this act of restoration should be accepted by the King

"as a most powerful and convincing proof not only of the responsibility he is under to render immediate reparation for real wrongs committed upon British subjects or their property, but also of the importance which attaches to the maintenance of those friendly and reciprocally advantageous relations which have for so many years subsisted between the two nations."

The people of Hawaii have dedicated one of the public squares of Honolulu to the memory of this just and generous restoration of their national life.

The questions raised by Commissioner Blount's report—and the statement of facts given in these pages rests on the testimony of annexationists—take precedence of any question of territorial expansion. Through the action of their representative the United States were placed on January 16 and 17 in the position of armed invaders of a friendly state, giving countenance and moral support to a plot to overturn a Government, which could not otherwise have succeeded and would not otherwise have been attempted. The character of that Government does not enter into the question of the observance of our treaty obligations to it or into that consideration which is due to the weak from the strong in the mind of every American.

EUGENE TYLER CHAMBERLAIN.

II.—A PLEA FOR ANNEXATION.

BY THE HON. JOHN L. STEVENS, RECENTLY UNITED STATES
MINISTER TO HAWAII.

A GRAVE question is now before the American people, the wrong solution of which will deeply affect the moral standing of the United States before the world. Will the American nation stand by its century's record in favor of republican government and of free Christian civilization, or will it repudiate its past by using its power to murder its own offspring and to stamp out the reforming work of pure and noble men and women who have made the Hawaiian Islands what they are, thus following the once infamous example of the Austrian Hapsburgs in stifling the noble aspirations of Italy and Hungary. The facts and reasons given in the following article bear on the inquiry: Shall this Nation continue its policy towards Hawaii on the lines indicated by Marcy, Seward, Grant and Blaine, or shall it follow a different and uncertain path, endangering, if not disgracefully sacrificing, American prestige and American interests in the North Pacific?

When Cook first saw Hawaii, in 1778, he estimated the population at four hundred thousand. This undoubtedly was an exaggeration. The real numbers probably did not exceed two hundred and fifty thousand, and on the arrival of the American missionaries, in 1820, there were not more than one hundred and fifty thousand. This rapid reduction of the native population prior to the advent of the missionaries conclusively answers the charge that Christian instruction and Christian life were influential in decimating the native Hawaiians. There are reasons for the belief that this decrease of the race had already been operative before Cook's discovery, and that this earlier tendency to extinction has been augmented by the vices of men claiming to be civilized, while more hostile to Christian efforts than the original barbarians. The reduction has gone on consecutively from the two hundred and fifty thousand in the time of Cook to the thirty-four thousand at the present date.

Nothing more conclusively than these figures proves that the future of the Islands must be controlled by other than the native race. These beautiful and sunny isles, with their rich resources and splendid future possibilities, must and will be improved and

governed by an intelligent and powerful race. While the surviving natives should be most kindly dealt with, allowed every possible opportunity to improve their condition and help themselves, it would be throwing to the winds all past experience and historical instruction to think longer of governing the Islands by the native race which comprises about one-third of the population. The native monarchy was continued twenty years after the seeds of death were in its members. The Kamehameha race of kings, who reigned ninety years, became extinct in 1874. During the most of that period the natives constituted a very large majority of the population, and most of the kings of that dynasty had more or less ability and tried to rule for the welfare of their people. The monarchy then rested on a logical foundation. There were numerous chiefs subordinate to the king, and the mass of the population when the missionaries arrived among them were in abject servile subjection to the king and chiefs, who held the land, fishing rights, and timber, the chief property of the Islands. Thus there was a kind of feudal system on which the monarchy rested, somewhat analogous to the foundation on which European monarchies were long maintained.

The missionaries who began their labors there in 1820 were no ordinary men. They were clergymen, teachers and physicians. The native monarch had enough natural sense to perceive the value of their intelligent assistance. These missionaries were obliged to deal with men and things as they found them. They obtained a healthy influence over the king and chiefs. By unwearied efforts, in the progress of time and events, a tolerable native monarchy was established and a full code of laws—mostly of American type—was enacted and put in force, and the American school system inaugurated. No other kind of government was then practicable. This state of things went on until 1874, when the Kamehameha race of kings became extinct by death. In the meanwhile the chiefs and their families had nearly all passed to their graves. Thus the logical foundation of the monarchy—the Hawaiian feudal system—no longer existed. Who should fill the vacant throne? This the Legislature decided by the election of David Kalakaua, the American influence being exerted in his support in preference to another candidate with British sympathies and affiliations. A large number of native Hawaiians, stirred up by irresponsible white men, re-

sisted this election, drove the Legislature from its hall of assemblage, and created a formidable riot. Soldiers and sailors were landed from the United States vessels then in the harbor of Honolulu, and the riot was suppressed,—thus, in effect, this elected king was secured on the throne by American influence.

It did not take long to prove Kalakaua's utter unfitness as a ruler. Weak, good-natured and dissolute, he soon drew around him men and women of like character, and the influence of himself and favorites was very deleterious to private and public morals throughout the Islands, especially among the natives. Reckless in expenditures, greedy of gain to gratify his vicious tastes and to feed his unworthy favorites, he was a fitting tool of those who knew how to make use of the semi-barbarous king to their pecuniary advantage, and who openly boasted of their dictatorial powers at the Hawaiian palace. Instead of drawing around him the best men, as his Kamehameha predecessors had often done, he fell into the hands of irresponsible adventurers. This continued to such an increased degree as to bring its culmination in 1887, when all the respectable and responsible men of the Islands were obliged to take decisive action. Kalakaua had then been for several years chiefly under the control of one Gibson, an American by birth, who went to Hawaii as a Mormon missionary, gained political power by stirring up the native Hawaiians against the white citizens, raising the cry of "Hawaii for the Hawaiians." He became the king's chief minister, and soon completely dominated him and the rest of the cabinet.

The incidental event which finally precipitated the revolution of 1887 was the king's taking a bribe of seventy thousand dollars in gold for a license to sell opium in the Islands. This gold was carried in bags to the palace, and expended by the king for his personal uses. The king then sold the license to another party for a larger sum and did not return the seventy thousand dollars to the first purchaser. Though the Islands were then exceedingly prosperous, the taxes and expenses were so largely increased by worse than useless expenditures and official corruption, that the taxpayers had no alternative but to take decisive measures. They organized and armed, and with united voice demanded the dismissal of Gibson, the establishment

of a new constitution taking from the king much of the power which he had so abused, and the creation of a Ministry responsible to a majority of the legislature. Finding himself powerless to withstand this just demand of the principal citizens of the Island, the king yielded, removed Gibson from his office, and consented to the appointment of a Reform Ministry, three of them being from the best men of the Islands, two of them born in Hawaii of sturdy American stock and thoroughly American in ideas and sympathies.

At the time of this uprising in 1887 many wished to abolish the monarchy at once. But the more conservative said: "Let the monarchy be tried once more under new restrictions." Many of the American residents, especially those of the old missionary stock, were tender and forbearing towards the native rulers and disliked to assent to extreme measures, so long as there was a possibility of getting on with a native monarchy. The more resolute and radical reformers yielded to the views of the conservatives. Every careful observer of the circumstances then saw clearly that should the monarchy again fall into the hands of adventurers and repeat its imbecility and corruption, it could not survive. While Kalakaua was facile and good natured, he had never assented to the new constitution in good faith. He sought opportunities to change it and to regain his lost power. When he died in January, 1890, his sister Liliuokalani by his appointment became the sovereign. Liliuokalani had strongly disapproved of her brother's assent to the reform constitution of 1887. She was known to have been in the Wilcox plot, the armed revolt of 1889, for the overthrow of the constitutional government. Incapable of ruling, self-willed to extreme obstinacy, she soon fell into the hands of the unworthy, openly defying public and private morals.

Scorning the opinions and advice of all the best men of the Islands, both of her own race and the whites, she finally united her political fortunes with the opium ring and those who were leagued to carry through the Legislature a sweeping lottery charter of the Louisiana type, which, if its originators could have been successful in their plans, would have given the palace adventurers, the opium ring, and the lottery gang, complete control of the Hawaiian government, and made Honolulu not only a secure opium depot, but a strong fortress from which the

lottery men could play on the American, Canadian, and Australian people. Deep in the conspiracy to remove the Wilcox-Jones Ministry, whom all the best men of the Islands wished to continue, she signed the lottery and opium bills, appointed to her Cabinet the men who had been the chief parties in bribing the lottery bill through the Legislature, and followed this with an attempted *coup d'etat*, calling a worthless mob of retainers to her assistance, trying to proclaim a constitution giving herself arbitrary power, overturning an incorruptible Supreme Court, and giving to herself the appointment of new judges. This was Saturday, January 14, 1893. From that hour the Hawaiian monarchy was dead, and no restoration is possible, except by the exercise of some outside and foreign force. At the date of her downfall Liliuokalani was without the sympathy and aid of the best of the native Hawaiians and of nearly all the respectable and responsible white residents of the Islands.

Amid the exciting events in Honolulu following the revolutionary attempts of Liliuokalani to proclaim a despotic constitution, by which she flung away her crown, a small force of marines and sailors was landed from the United States ship "Boston," as a precautionary step for the protection of American life and property, and as a safeguard against night incendiarism stimulated by the hope of plunder, greatly feared by many of the best citizens. This was doing precisely what had been repeatedly done in previous exciting days in Honolulu, during a period running back many years. The men of the "Boston" came on shore nearly fifty hours after the fall of the queen, in whose defence no effective aid was offered by those who had surrounded her in her carnival of immorality and official corruption. The naval commander and the United States Minister earnestly sought to faithfully carry out the prior rules of the Legation, especially those contained in the last instructions issued to the United States Minister and naval commander, by Secretary Bayard, July 12, 1887. Neither by force, threats, nor intimidation, did the United States officials oppose the fallen queen or aid the Provisional Government, the latter being supported by the same men, with now increased numbers, who found it imperatively necessary to take despotic power from King Kalakaua in 1887, by the adoption of the reformed constitution, and who crushed out the Wilcox rebellion in 1889. All asser-

tions to the contrary as to the action of the United States officials and marines are absolutely untrue and certain to be swept aside by time and history, however plausibly stated and however strongly these assertions may be supported by the perjured testimony of persons deeply compromised by the vices and unlawful actions of which they had been guilty before Liliuokalani lost her throne.

The Hawaiian monarchy being thus extinct, and the Hawaiian Islands being not sufficient to constitute an independent nation, all who really understand their situation know that good government is now the first and imperative need. Such being the fact, they apply for admission to the American Union as a Territory. Their best and now controlling citizens do not wish to be admitted as a State. By property interests, commercial association, by school and political education, by the general prevalence of American laws, legal decisions, social and religious ideas, these Islands have become thoroughly Americanized. Go into the Chamber of Commerce, into the principal churches, into the courts, into the schools of Honolulu, Hilo, and other chief towns in the Islands, and you would think yourself in New England or western New York. American ideas and interests are all dominant. For sixty years the Islands have had the American school system. American superintendents and teachers have had the chief management of these schools in all these years, and English is now the chief language taught in them. At the head of the Protestant College at Honolulu is an American president, and the principal professors are Americans. In the Catholic college the professors are chiefly from the United States and are strongly American in sentiment. The Kamehameha Industrial School, to establish which an American and his native wife, a woman of intelligence and excellent character, now deceased, have given nearly seven hundred thousand dollars, which has been in successful operation for years, where the native boys obtain an intellectual training and learn the various mechanical trades, has an entire corps of American teachers. The city High-School, admirably managed, has a superior American teacher at its head. The two principal daily newspapers are edited, owned, and published by Americans. The principal lawyers at the bar and on the bench are Americans, born on the Islands of American parentage or in the United States, and educated in American colleges. More

than eighty per cent. of the trade, amounting to more than twenty million dollars per year, is with the United States. American newspapers, magazines, and books are in as familiar use in the Islands as in the United States. A striking proof of the deeply rooted American feeling and opinions is evinced by the celebration of the Fourth of July, which is done with an enthusiasm similar to what was shown among us on our great national day fifty years ago.

In presenting themselves for admission into the American Union the Islands come under more American aspects than any of our previously annexed States or Territories. A recent writer in an American magazine, a man of European birth and education, and of more or less sympathy with his fatherland, objects to the annexation of the Islands for the reason that there were, in 1890, but 1,928 Americans living upon them. He is evidently unacquainted with the real facts, else he carelessly allows his language to state a truth in a way to utter an untruth. It is true that, according to the census of 1890, there were then but about two thousand persons residing in Hawaii who were born in the United States. But in addition to these a large proportion of the 7,500 born on the Islands, of foreign parentage, and put down as Hawaiians, are of American parentage, and they form an important part of the American colony. They were educated in American ideas and sentiments, their leading men being graduates of American colleges. Some of these served in the Union army, suffered in Southern prisons, bear on their persons honorable scars, or sleep in graves redolent of American patriotism. I have seen some of these men on Decoration Day march through the streets of Honolulu, from their Grand Army Post, to the beautiful cemetery where a goodly number of their comrades are buried, amid tokens of public respect not surpassed in any of our American cities. One of the dead heroes, born in Honolulu, of an American father and mother, who did long and noble service to rescue the Islands from barbarism and to save them from hostile European domination, was General Armstrong, who for many years served this country so devotedly in the great educational work for colored men at Hampton, and who not long before his lamented death made a powerful plea to Americans to stand by Hawaii in her American aspirations. Who assumes to say that these men have not the

right to ask to come under the American flag? What they now ask to do is what forty years ago Secretary Marcy, of the then existing Democratic administration, asked them to do ; they are now ready to accept.

But what of the twelve thousand of the European-born residents of Hawaii—Germans, Scandinavians, English, Portuguese. Most of them are Americanized and wish for annexation. Their chief business relations are with the United States, their children are educated in the American-Hawaiian schools, and are as thoroughly American as our own adopted citizens. The Portuguese, numbering about 9,000, are unanimous in their strong sympathies with us. Their children are educated in American schools, and receive American ideas with remarkable alacrity. The reasons are obvious why they are a unit for annexation. All the best of the native Hawaiians are in the same way of thinking. But it may be said that the Chinese and Japanese population are objectionable. I need not say that a large majority of these are not permanent residents of the Islands, being temporarily employed on the plantations, intending to return home, according to the stipulations of their contract, when their term of service shall have been completed.

A paramount reason why annexation should not be long postponed is that, if it soon takes place, the crown and government lands will be cut up and sold to American and Christian Caucasian people, thus preventing the Islands from being submerged and overrun by Asiatics, putting an end to Japanese ambitions stimulated by our strong European rival.

It is strictly correct and just to call those who now support the Provisional Government in Hawaii an American colony. England, Germany, France, Holland, and Spain—the chief European nations which long have had colonial possessions—have not on the earth colonies more decisively their own than that which the United States possesses in Hawaii. By the foresight and generous contributions of the American Board of Missions, by the intelligence and devoted labors of those it sent to the Islands, and the encouraging policy of the American Government for sixty years, these Islands have been won from heathen barbarism and their population imbued with American ideas. In the faith that some day they would come under the flag of the land of their fathers, the sons and grandsons of American missionaries,

teachers, physicians, and merchants, now supporting the cause of annexation, have been reared. A more patriotic body of Americans does not exist. Shall we break faith with them now? Shall we place them at the mercy of stupendous corruption available to our national rivals? To do so would be to press the brand of shame on the noble and expansive brow of the American Republic. It would be a piece of infamy of which no great nation has ever been guilty, to look coldly on and see an American colony standing with a spotless record on those beautiful Islands, the advanced post of American civilization, struck down by a league of foreign adventurers, gamblers and national enemies. It would justly bring on us the moral opprobrium of the world.

There is not space allowed me in this article to speak of the vast importance of Hawaii to the future commercial power of the United States in the Pacific. Consider what it implies that this nation possesses four thousand miles of shore line on that mighty ocean, not including the seventeen hundred miles on that marvellous body of water, Puget Sound. Consider that two-fifths of this great country outlets on the Pacific, now reached by five trans-continental lines of railroad. Consider that there are those now already born in the United States who will live to see our population number two hundred and fifty millions of souls, with manufactures amounting to thousands of millions of dollars per annum, which must have an outlet wherever American enterprise and the American flag shall hold a commanding position. Consider that, in the opinion of all naval and commercial experts, Hawaii with its Pearl Harbor is the key to the North Pacific, which is the waterway over which five hundred millions of people, at no distant day, will make their traffic. Consider that all the great statesmen of America, from the days of John Quincy Adams to this date, have desired and looked forward to Americanizing and acquiring this splendid ocean possession, now offered to us without the cost of a single dollar or a single life.

But it is said that Hawaii is not contiguous territory. It is as much so as our Alaska land, whose immense value the genius of Seward and Sumner foresaw. It should not be forgotten that contiguity of water is sometimes more important than contiguity of land. It would be well if some of our public men would carefully study the remarkable work of Captain Mahan on "Sea

Power." Why did Peter the Great of Russia, the ablest monarch of his century, wrestle with such tremendous energy for dominancy of the Baltic? Why did Gustavus Adolphus, perhaps the ablest ruler of the seventeenth century, contend with such skill and bravery to secure the power of Sweden on the same northern sea? These remarkable men saw clearly the supreme value of contiguity of water to their respective countries. Why do France and Italy attach supreme importance to their influence on the Mediterranean, to secure which they have expended vast sums of money, and shed freely of their people's blood? Because they have believed, for the best of reasons, that the contiguity of that sea to their cities and harbors is invaluable to them.

To say that we do not need the Hawaiian Islands as a security to our immense future interests is but the babble of children or of incompetent men. It is blindly and recklessly to ignore the logic of irresistible circumstances, and to scoff at the plainest teachings of history. No! America cannot get rid of her future responsibilities if she would, and all attempts to do so will be at the cost of her future generations. In the light of these inexorable truths, in the name of what is most sacred in Christian civilization, in behalf of a noble American colony, holding the advanced post of America's progress, I cherish the faith that the American people, the American statesmen, and the American government, thoughtful of America's great future, will settle the Hawaiian question wisely and well—will see to it that the flag of the United States floats unmolested over the Hawaiian Islands.

JOHN L. STEVENS.

III.—OUR PRESENT DUTY.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER.

In the complications which have arisen recently in the Hawaiian Islands a few residents, prompted by their personal interests, nearly all of whom are of foreign birth and many of whom are aliens, have sought to embroil our government in the internal affairs of a peaceful, but feeble nation. The pretext for this intervention is based upon the alleged fact that the government of the queen of the Hawaiian Islands was a "semi-barbaric mon-

archy resting on no solid or moral foundation, dead in everything but its vices, coarsely luxurious in its tastes and wishes, constantly sending out impure exhalations, and spreading social and political demoralization throughout the islands." This is the indictment against the monarchy made by the late minister, Mr. Stevens, who, after leaving the islands, further assails the government to which he was so recently accredited as a diplomatic representative, by charging that the queen has sustained scandalous and immoral relations with one of her ministers. This being the alleged condition of the government of Hawaii, an appeal is made to the moral sentiment of the American people to justify the overthrow of that government and establish in its stead what its friends and supporters have denominated "a Christian government," by which we may assume, is meant a government whose administrators profess the Christian religion.

The provisional government which was established had no other foundation for its existence than what is called "the great mass meeting of January 16," at which the whole attendance did not exceed sixteen hundred persons. At this meeting a committee of public safety was appointed, which committee "proclaimed" a provisional government. This provisional government was not even submitted to the town meeting for its approval. It could not have maintained an existence for an hour had it not been for the fact that the marine forces on board the United States steamship "Boston", then lying in the harbor, were, at the request of the committee of public safety and the American minister, landed, and were stationed at such points as the American minister, acting in conjunction with the provisional government, directed. These armed forces of the United States remained on shore in Honolulu for seventy-five days, and thus this remarkable revolution in the Hawaiian Islands was accomplished. The government of Hawaii, whatever may have been its faults, was not founded upon bayonets, the whole number of the armed forces of the queen being less than one hundred, a mere police or constabulary force for maintaining law and order in and about the public buildings in the city of Honolulu. The local government was overpowered by the mere presence of the United States troops. The queen states, in her appeal to the President of the United States, that she surrendered to the superior forces of this government in order to avoid unnecessary conflict, and trusting

to the justice of our government, when all the facts shall be known, to reinstate her in her rightful position.

Whether the government of Hawaii was a just one, a moral one, or an efficient one, is a matter which does not concern the American people. We have no more right to overthrow a monarchy in Hawaii because it does not conform to our ideas of a just government, than we have to overthrow a monarchy in Canada or Great Britain, or Russia or Turkey, or Spain or elsewhere.

But it is alleged that the presence of the United States forces on shore was necessary to the protection of American life and property. This claim can only be supported upon the assumption that American citizens were actually in danger in their persons and in their property while peacefully pursuing their business there. If American citizens were interfering with the local government and using their influence to overthrow it, they had no right to claim the protection of American forces in this unlawful and revolutionary procedure. If they were peaceable and obeying the local law they were in no danger whatever. There is not an allegation that one of the subjects of Great Britain or of France or Germany or of China or Japan or of any other government required the interposition of the armed forces of their governments for their protection, or that the property of these subjects of such governments was in any way endangered by anything that was being done at the time. It is passing strange if ours were the only foreign citizens who were endangered in their lives or their property. If the citizens of the United States who were in Honolulu at the time had been minding their own business and had kept their hands out of the affairs of the local government, they would no more have been in danger of their lives and property than were the citizens and subjects of other governments. Besides this, what injury could a weak and defenceless government, such as that of Hawaii, have inflicted upon the citizens of the United States, when all the armed forces of the monarchy did not exceed a hundred persons all told? Therefore the claim that the lives or property of American citizens were in danger is a mere pretext, having no foundation whatever in fact.

The people of the United States are not responsible for the kind of government that may be in existence in the Hawaiian Islands. Nor is it any of their concern as to whether that government deals justly with its citizens and subjects or not.

Whether the government of Hawaii is a good government or a just government is a matter for the people of that island to determine for themselves. There is no divine right of republicanism in this world, any more than there is a divine right of kings. The divinity in all these matters is in the right of the people to govern themselves.

In this connection it is worthy of remark that the American minister, Mr. Blount, in his report to this government, summarized by Secretary Gresham, states that while at Honolulu he did not meet a single annexationist who expressed a willingness to submit the question of annexation to a vote of the people, nor did he talk with one on that subject who did not insist that if the Islands were annexed to the United States, suffrage should be so restricted as to give complete control to foreigners or white persons. I have, myself, on several occasions, conversed with those representing the provisional government in Washington upon this very point, and I inquired especially of them why means were not taken to submit the question to the people of Hawaii as to whether they desired to maintain the provisional government or to be annexed to the United States. In every instance I was informed that the people of the islands were not capable of self-government, and if the question were submitted to them that they would be hostile to this movement. The fact is that the people of Hawaii have never been consulted upon this subject. The so-called provisional government did not emanate from them, and does not have their sanction. It is a usurpation, which could not have had any *de facto* existence, to say nothing of a rightful existence, except for the presence of the overpowering armed forces of the United States. What right has a provisional government, thus established, to make a treaty with the government of the United States for the annexation of those islands to our government? Who has clothed this provisional government with authority to speak for the people they pretend to represent?

Our own right to self-government is no more sacred than the right of the handful of ignorant Hawaiians in the Sandwich Islands to govern themselves. If they prefer a monarchy, feeble and inefficient though it may be, it is their business, and not ours. But it is claimed that the provisional government is one composed of Christians, and that they are representatives of advanced Christian civilization. The United States, being a Christian

nation, should sympathize with and render moral and material aid in sustaining that government; and it is alleged that we have no right to consent to its overthrow. It may be conceded, for the sake of argument, that the provisional government is composed of Christians, and that it more nearly corresponds to our ideas of a just government than does the government of the monarchy, but, as suggested before, this is foreign to the controversy. We have no more right to interfere on this ground with the government of Hawaii than we have to interfere with the government of China or Japan or Turkey, none of which are Christian or administered by Christian statesmen, and none of which, we have a right to assume, are any more just to the subjects of such government than is the monarchy of Hawaii to its subjects.

Such a claim would make the United States the moral and religious arbiter of the world; would constitute us self-appointed crusaders, going about the earth pulling down and destroying alleged heathen and semi-barbaric monarchies, and establishing Christian governments and civilization in their stead. This is not the mission of our government. If we have any concern as to the imperfection of these so-called barbaric governments, we may send our missionaries to them to convert them to our religion or send our statesmen among them to convince them of the superior advantages of our form of government. But to send our naval forces to the ports of other governments, to land them upon their soil, and allow them to be used for the purpose of overthrowing, in connection with foreign-born subjects or aliens, the established government, would make our Christianity a fraud and our boasted republicanism a mockery. Who would suppose for a moment that our government would have permitted such an intervention in the affairs of an island or dependence of Great Britain, or in any province owing allegiance to Great Britain, or to any other powerful government? We would not dare to assume such a rôle. It would be regarded as a declaration of war, and we would be compelled to withdraw our forces and apologize for our intervention.

The question is frequently asked in partisan papers, "How can the monarchy be restored?" or, "By what right does the government of the United States assume to reëstablish a monarchy which has been overthrown?" The government of the

United States has no more right to establish a monarchy in Hawaii than it has to establish one in Mexico or in Central America. But it is the duty of the United States Government, when its agents and representatives have committed a wrong against the government of a friendly power, to redress that wrong, and in this case it can only be accomplished by placing the government in *statu quo*, or in the condition in which it was found at the time the armed forces of the United States were landed upon Hawaiian soil, and interposed in the local affairs of the monarchy. We cannot redress the wrong we have committed by merely withdrawing our forces, after they have been used for seventy-five days to suppress the existing government and establish a provisional government in its stead. We must restore to the queen her own armed forces and we must disarm the forces of the provisional government which were armed and equipped by the aid and under the protection of our navies. Anything short of this is a mockery of justice, a disgrace to our diplomacy, is unworthy of a Christian nation, and a travesty upon our devotion to the principles of local self-government.

If the restoration of the *status quo*, which existed prior to the landing of our forces on Hawaiian soil, should result in the restoration of the monarchy, such restoration would only demonstrate the fact that the overthrow of the monarchy was due to our intervention. If it does not result in a restoration of the monarchy, then we have washed our hands of responsibility in the matter, and have vindicated the integrity of our diplomacy and the high character of our government as one which loves justice and maintains international comity. Therefore it is not the restoration of the monarchy which is in issue, but it is the restoration of the condition which existed prior to the armed intervention of the United States. Justice requires that our government should go back thus far, and when we have thus done justice we are not responsible for the injustice that others may do. We must maintain our integrity as a nation. We must vindicate our regard for the rights of a weak and defenceless government.

One other matter is worthy of consideration, and upon that there is room for honest differences of opinion. Is it desirable that the Hawaiian Islands should be annexed to the United States? What would result from annexation? The so-called treaty which

was submitted by the provisional government to the late administration of President Harrison and the Senate for its consideration, provided that our government should assume the debts of the monarchy and should grant a pension to the deposed Queen and to some members of her family. In the event of annexation the inhabitants of the islands would become citizens of the United States, unless they chose to expatriate themselves, or to continue as the subjects of a foreign government. The native Hawaiians would become citizens of the United States. They would have no place else to go for a home or for a domicile. They are ignorant of our laws, and of our institutions, and are incapable of self-government under a system such as that which we have in the United States. The laws which would be passed especially for government of the islands would be passed by the Congress of the United States and all general laws and the constitution of the United States would be over them as over other points of the United States. Laws which would be passed at Washington to govern a people who had no representation whatever in the law-making power, would have as little regard for the wishes of the people as would the laws imposed upon them by the monarchical form of government. In neither case would the people have anything to do with the making of the laws which should govern. There would be serious objections to permitting the admission of the islands into the Union as a State with two Senators and a Representative in Congress. Their civilization, their habits, their ideas of government will not assimilate with our institutions and we do not need the aid of the representatives of such a government in the councils of the nation to assist us in the solution of the governmental problems with which our people have to contend. Annexation therefore is of very doubtful expediency.

What is desirable so far as these islands are concerned, and what is the interest of the United States in reference to them? It seems to me that our true interests lie in the direction of a neutral and independent government of the Hawaiian Islands—a government for which we would not be responsible and which would not entitle its citizens to the protection of the government of the United States. Let them govern themselves in their own way, and as our government should maintain a neutrality as to the local government of Hawaii we should insist that all other governments should maintain like neutrality and like

non-intervention. The example which President Cleveland's administration has set in reference to these islands will enable us to successfully insist that other nations shall maintain a like policy. We should regard the seizure of the government of Hawaii by any other power as *casus belli* and resist it accordingly. The neutrality and independence of Hawaii as to all other governments is the policy which should be maintained and insisted upon by our government. We need those islands as a coaling station for our merchant marine and our vessels of war. We need them as harbors of refuge for our commerce upon the seas. We need them as places for meeting and exchanging on the high seas our products with the products of other countries. So long as these privileges are granted to us we have no right to object to like privileges being granted to other governments. Hence it is of the highest importance to the commerce of the world and to the peace of nations that the Sandwich Islands should be guaranteed by all governments a separate and independent existence, whose advantages should be shared alike by all the nations of the world, and which should, under no circumstances, be appropriated to the exclusive use of any one of them. As believers in the superiority and efficacy of republican institutions, as compared with monarchical, we may indulge the hope that the example of our own government and the advantages of our civilization may soon induce the people of Hawaii, acting upon their own judgment and desiring to promote their own interests, to suppress their monarchy and establish in its place a republican form of government. This will require time and the education of the masses. In the near future the education necessary to fit that people for self-government will be attained. It is education and not armed intervention that will bring about the reformation which every American citizen should desire.

WILLIAM M. SPRINGER.